America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 74 WWW.CODOH.ORG November 2000

REVISIONISM UNDER FIRE

THE CAMPUS PROJECT

Bradley R. Smith

There's no doubt that revisionism has been hugely successful in the year 2000 -- until now. In the last couple of months it has become clear that our successes have been blunted by what appears to be a coordinated campaign to shut down revisionism for good.

The first hint that something wasn't quite right was when the Campus Project failed to get off the ground on schedule. Test mailings to four Southern states and to Massachusetts failed to get any response whatever (see SR 73). This is the first time in ten years that we have not begun to run our new yearly ad in as many as twenty papers in the first thirty days. As a kind of double check I sent small ads to the campuses, some promoting CODOHWeb and others *The Revisionist*. The Worcester Polytechnic Institute *Tech* (Rochester NY) is the only paper that responded. They are running the ad announcing *The Revisionist*.

Not knowing what to make of the situation, but there being no way to go but straight ahead, I send the ad to our entire "A" list. Once again, it failed completely. Not one campus newspaper has run it. It's not easy to know

(Continued on page 5)

THE DAVID IRVING VS "OJ" LIPSTADT TRIAL

George Brewer

Everyone is familiar with the fact that a court case has two aspects. On the one hand, there is the case as it is decided in a court of law, on the other hand, there is the case as it is decided in the court of public opinion. Frequently a victory in one venue can entail a defeat in the other. The most famous case in recent memory involved OJ Simpson, the former football star, who was acquitted in court of the murder of his ex-wife and a waiter, but who was overwhelmingly considered guilty in the court of public opinion.

Sometimes one can lose a case in court but be vindicated by public opinion as well. We remember that in 1925 John T. Scopes was found guilty of teaching evolution in Tennessee schools, but what most people remember about the trial now is that by virtue of this trial academic freedom and evolution made great strides in public consciousness, so that, in the larger sense, Scopes won.

This duality with regard to legal cases is to a certain extent built into any society ruled by law. Laws are, after all, little more than the petrification of old opinions; they reflect the common sense of their time, something that is more often informed by passion than principle. Thus, if we turn over the pages of the statute books we can easily find many laws that will appear both unjust and absurd to a later time, not only trivial laws against black flags (because of anarchism), but more serious ones as well.

From the standpoint of public governance, respect for the rule of law is paramount, therefore it is desirable to see

(Continued on page 3)

LETTERS

Thanks for coming to the David McCalden Memorial. Your remembrances were the high point of the evening.

Got your latest newsletter today. Good information, as always, although some of your responses to Boston University John Silber seem more rhetorically cute than substantively relevant. Thought that may be something that has to be resorted to in order to get the attention of certain classes of readers.

GH, Los Angeles

I'm not entirely happy with my response to Dr. Silber, for the reasons you mention. At the time I wrote it, I wanted to talk to Silber in a way that he is not accustomed to being addressed. It was as if I were disciplining him. I think now that if I were to do it over again I might take another tack.

I recently discovered the CODOH Website and, inter alia, read your two recent letters pertinent to the CODOH university newspaper advertisement. The latter were so articulate and well presented that I will certainly be a frequent visitor to your Website.

I experienced in a very small way the attempts of an American elementary school instructor to reinvent the history of my own people (the Acadiens and other French-Canadians) to suit and sustain her own formula of cultural and psychological biases. I find a similarity between that childhood revelation and my reaction to the current "revelations" of an industry which seems bent on turning certain alleged events during WWII into the very centerpiece of world history -- to the sole benefit of those profiting from the industry and the bemuddlement of everyone else.

Please accept my congratulations on presenting a clear, intelligent and sometimes even humorous alternative view to events which otherwise pour from all other available media (including French-language media) as not only above public question but even above private doubt. I am now a rather elderly man and I have come at long last to the realization that however much the rest of my existence may fall under the dictate of forces beyond my control, my thoughts, at least, can and must remain free and under my own sole command.

My apologies for using a "nom de guerre" (or "depoltronnerie," as the case may be) at least for the present -- I remain cordially yours,

"L'Acadien Errant"

I wish to congratulate MacKenzie Paine for the magnificent letter she wrote the other day: Not one word of "hate" in it and most convincing, in my opinion. I appreciated Audrey Jones' letter, too, that was sent to me by our dear Orest Slepokura.

I just would like to point out one little thing, if you don't mind: I quite agree that one cannot take the BIG LIE down in one go -- we've been fighting here in France for 21 years now, and are not finished! -- but there is one danger, I believe, in talking so much about the Holocaust INDUSTRY (I'm not talking about Finkelstein's book).

The very mentioning of the "Holocaust industry" in some way puts the stress on the word "industry," thereby confirming the idea that there was, indeed, a Holocaust, with a big H, which there was not! The actual point we must stress is the fact that there were no gas chambers. That is really the lie they don't want us to touch (remember Vidal-Naquet saying "Abandonner la chambre gaz, c'est capituler en rase campagne").

As you may have seen, lots of Jews have agreed to Finkelstein's idea that there has been an "industry," many of them are ready to admit that point. And there'll be more. They don't really mind, as long as you don't touch the gas chambers myth. But it is the gas-chamber lie the whole world is resting on!

To make it short, I would say that: exposing and criticizing the Holocaust industry is dangerous because it reinforces the Holocaust myth. I don't know if my bad English is clear enough...?

(Name deleted in the interest of privacy. But she is an associate of Robert Faurisson.)

I understand the logic in what you say and don't disagree with it, but as they say; "There's more than one way to skin the cat." No need for all of us to focus on the same tactics. I think we should hit this story from every direction, continually probe for its weak spots, and let one thing lead to another.

[We have gotten a couple nasty letters from academics who have received our editorials, who happen to be lawyers as well as communications professors. One volunteer who is helping us build our email lists sends us these observations.]

Let us assume a lawyer for the bad guys wins a lawsuit against us. Consider these three things: Bradley would be bankrupted and have to flee the country. But Bradley is already bankrupt and has already fled the country! It would ruin Bradley's credentials. But, as he himself says, he has no credentials. It would ruin his reputation and his credibility. But according to the PC crowd, Bradley has no reputation and no credibility whatever.

What this means is that Bradley will not lose anything no matter what happens. I don't know about Audrey, David Thomas or the rest of the Inner Circle, but my wife and I have a lot to lose if the long tentacles of the Chosenites reach us.. Sooooo -- I'm not going to include any lawyers on the lists I'm building for you. Hope you understand.

Lee Ronald

I do understand. It's my good fortune to be broke, an ex-patriot with no credentials, no reputation, and no credibility. We do not want to antagonize lawyers needlessly. You

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

left out the part about the Israeli "authorities" seeing my work as being particularly pernicious, but I can live with that. We only go 'round once, eh? Take care of yourself.

Thank you for sending me *Smith's Report*. It makes me feel good to know that you are continuing to be successful in the battle with the propagandists of the Half-truth – the Holocaust. I occasionally visit CODOHWeb when I'm at the local library, but I have no computer of my own.

I suggest that CODOH print more stuff for **SR** subscribers, not just for myself but for all of us who do not own a computer, or who are not Online or do not have a printer. I'm enclosing a contribution to help keep you going.

NS, Concord, MA

Another example of how great minds think alike. It's my experience that you are right, and that many **SR** *readers are not able to download articles from CODOH-Web for one or more of the reasons you list above. Along with this issue of* **Smith's Report** *you will find the first new catalog of articles and other materials that we have put together in maybe eighteen months. The large majority of the materials are from the Web and are not available in print anywhere else!*

Note: In our continuing efforts to actually get organized, we have made substantial procedural changes for processing orders. If anyone has not received materials that you requested, please let me know and the items will be shipped promptly. If the items are no longer available, you will receive a refund.

Audrey

(Continued from page 1)

the tension between law, and public opinion kept to a minimum. Thus, when old statutes are challenged in such a way as to make them appear ridiculous -- the case involving a Virginia anti-sodomy statute some years ago comes to mind -- the law is usually quickly taken off the books. Or if a verdict is so much at variance with popular attitudes that it carries little authority, it is likely to be overturned in short order on a technicality. Such was the case with Scopes. Finally, if a verdict is so much at variance with public opinion that large segments of the public are outraged by it, some other legal mechanism will be brought into play. This last was resorted to in the case of O. J. Simpson who, while vindicated of the murder charge, was eventually found responsible for the deaths of his ex-wife and a luckless bystander.

It follows that a court case, especially a celebrated one, is not really over just because the verdict is in. There is still the battle in the court of public opinion that needs to be won. This fact may help explain what is now a very curious result of the Irving-Lipstadt libel trial concluded last April.

Lipstadt's Road Show

As you will recall, Deborah Lipstadt, an instructor of Jewish theology at a small US college, published a book in 1993 entitled *Denying the Holocaust.* After being urged to do so by Israeli historian Yehuda Bauer, Lipstadt included in her book a potpourri of accusations against British historian David Irving.

Most of the statements of fact made about Irving were false or misleading, many of the other statements were libelous, and Lipstadt's book was easily construed by Irving as well as others to be part of an ongoing campaign to destroy him. So Irving filed suit against Lipstadt in the fall of 1996. The case eventually came to trial this past January.

Irving's position was that Lipstadt had libeled him. Lipstadt's position-as articulated by her lawyers and experts since she never spoke in her defense -- was that Lipstadt's statements were true. The judge concluded that some of the statements were true, and others false, but that the true statements were more important than the false ones and therefore Lipstadt was not guilty of libel to a serious enough extent to justify damages to Irving.

Lipstadt's curious claque of left liberal supporters and Zionist hardliners immediately hailed the verdict. Although it was Irving's suit to win or lose, the perception was that Lipstadt had emerged triumphant over Irving. Certainly, in legal terms, she had won her case by not losing it. However, immediately after the verdict was in, it became clear that while Irving had been defeated in court, the battle in the court of public opinion was just beginning. Within hours, two of the most authoritative of British historians, Donald Cameron Watt and Sir John Keegan, rose to Irving's defense, praised his work as a historian, and in Sir John's case memorably disposed of Deborah Lipstadt's pretensions. These comments tended to completely offset not only the verdict but also the book and the worldwide campaign that had engendered the trial in the first place.

Six months later, we now find that members of Lipstadt's defense team will be traveling around the United States holding seminars at $35 dollars a head to "discuss" the "implications" of the case. This traveling road show includes not only Lipstadt's chief defense counsel, Richard Rampton and Heather Douglas, but also a Cambridge supernumerary for Richard Evans and Robert Jan Van Pelt. What could be the purpose of this enterprise? A number of explanations might be offered.

One is that it is being done to

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

raise funds to pay salaries: we now know, for example, that Lipstadt's defense team spent millions of dollars to pay its experts, and to ensure that Lipstadt herself remained mum and seated behind a table. Another is that the junket is meant to acquire funds for the appeal, now pending in London. Still another explanation could see in the campaign an effort to promote the Holocaust at a time when the Middle East is once more in upheaval. However, we believe that the effort represents something more basic: it constitutes an attempt to win over public opinion for the verdict of the trial.

The Court of Public Opinion

The idea that Lipstadt's defenders would be engaged in post-trial damage control may not seem on the surface to be an unusual idea. Nevertheless, it is an unusual situation. How often has the defense of other British trials felt obligated to travel to our shores to make their case? Richard Rampton, for example, before defending Lipstadt, was involved in a lengthy and even more expensive defense of McDonald's to the charges of animal rights activists in Britain. We don't recall the defense team coming to the US after that trial in order to expound on the humane procedures that go into the making of a Quarter Pounder. We don't recall, at the drive through window of our local McDonald's, receiving Richard Rampton scratch-off tickets that might defray the $35 cost of hearing him lecture, or a "Buy one, get one free" offer that would make it possible for us to purchase a Richard Rampton bobble-head cut-rate. The reason, of course, is that no one took the accusations against McDonald's seriously, so there was no one to win over.

In the case of Irving v. Lipstadt, however, there appears to be a substantial body of opinion to win over. For example, the most professional and at the same time least paid of Lipstadt's expert historians was Christopher Browning, of the University of North Carolina. Simultaneous with the verdict, Browning's newest book was released, one which pointedly referenced Irving's chief work, Hitler's War, in the notes. This is an academician's way of telegraphing peer support for a fellow historian: scholars frequently will cite the work of historians with whom they disagree, but they will never cite the work of someone they consider unimportant.

Ian Kershaw, another respected British historian of the modern era, whose social historical emphasis complements Irving's more biographical approach, has just published the second volume of his biography of *Adolf Hitler*, which contains the assessment that Hitler was not personally involved in several aspects of his empire, an assessment first made by Irving over 20 years ago. Kershaw does not reference Irving directly, but that may have been due to the pen of an editor eager to avoid controversy.

In the meantime, Irving has felt no compulsion to globetrot to explain himself. The reasons should be clear. First, while he failed in his suit, the support he received from the historical fraternity, as well as, paradoxically, from the presiding judge, indicate that his reputation as a historian is still intact. Besides, he has an appeal to prepare.

Conclusion

As we have seen, because a trial has a dual component one may win in court but still lose the battle for public opinion. But usually a legal vindication is enough for most people. One rarely sees the winner of a case attempting public self-justification. That is usually left to the loser, who then travels the circuit in search of financial and moral support. When, in the wake of his acquittal, OJ Simpson began a campaign of calling reporters and talk show hosts to state his case for the mysterious Colombian drug lords, most people were repelled by this attempt to get people to not only accept the verdict but to agree with it as well.

Yet this is precisely how Lipstadt's defenders are now acting. There appear to be two reasons for this. In the first place, their fond hope of destroying David Irving and putting the force of the Law behind their intolerant interpretation of history was dashed, almost immediately after the verdict was announced. In the second place they seem to have perceived that they have lost, and are losing, the battle for public opinion, or better in this case, scholarly opinion. The spate of articles and books that one would have expected to see if this case had enjoyed widespread support has not arrived. It seems clear that the public, or at any rate the intellectual classes, whose opinion would count for most in this case, are taking their time making up their minds about the facts.

Of course, there is a difference between Simpson's pathetic appeals to get people to believe him and Lipstadt's defenders. In the first place, just as Lipstadt refused to take the stand to defend herself, she has chosen to continue to hide behind her lawyers and her purported experts. A better analogy would be if OJ had recruited Kato Kaelin to call Larry King on his behalf. But the intrinsic similarity is still there. In both cases, defendants who won their cases felt compelled to take their cases to a wider public. This indicates an awareness of a lack of public support, an awareness that, when all is said and done, the winners were losers. It further suggests, if we carry the analogy to its end, fear, uncertainty, and above all, a guilty conscience.

[George Brewer is editor of CODOH's E-Zine *The Revisionist*.]

(Continued from page 1)
what to think, or what to do, when your fortunes turn against you, for reasons that you do not understand.

It's an interesting experience to have such a serious failure with a project when it has been so successful for so many years previously. It's challenging in a way that is invigorating, both strategically and tactically. At least for someone with my particular character. I have been presented with what the Mexicans call a *quebra cabeza* – a head breaker. I don't usually use military analogies, but I see myself as – not a general – but as a colonel who has engaged his regiment and finds that he is about to lose control of the situation, that events he does not yet understand have changed the conceptual structure of the battlefield.

And then of course there is the situation where at the start of every Fall campaign I am able to announce a whole series of successes on campus, and in return, those of you who support the work are encouraged and enthused and you send contributions to keep the campaign going. This fall I have reported only failure with the Campus Project, and in October contributions fell to the lowest level in three years.

So what the hell is going on? There may be a number of factors playing out on the world stage that are affecting how student editors, and their academic advisors, are reacting to the new ad. Some advertising departments accepted the ad only to have it rejected by the paper's editors. But mostly it has been silence. Simply – no response.

In a way, it was similar to what happened when Norman Finkelstein published *The Holocaust Industry*. When Finkelstein's previous book was about to be published, his opponents tried to stop publication. But no one tried to stop the publication of *The Holocaust Industry*. Instead, it was pointedly ignored in all media in the United States, even while it led to wide-ranging discussion in Europe.

It appears that the same strategy -- we might call it the "Great Ayoidance" -- is being widely practiced, and not just against CODOH and Norman Finkelstein. For example, a recent article about current Third Reich histories was prepared for the *New York Review of Books* by Gordon Craig of Stanford University. In some ways, it followed the trajectory of those revisionists theorists who think that the Holocaust will first be revised by not being discussed: there was no mention of "gas chambers," or "Auschwitz," or even "extermination." On the other hand, there was no reference to David Irving or his classic bio, *Hitler's War*, even though one of the books under review was a biography of Hitler, and even though one of the main judgments quoted in the review was taken from Irving's magisterial work. Can we see here the self-censorship of a prudent academician, or the blue pencil of an editor who wants to shut down controversy? It's hard to say.

Not to be outdone, public broadcasting television in the United States, as we go to press, financed a broadcast of a "docudrama" about the Irving-Lipstadt trial, with editing and commentary on its Internet websites to ensure that viewers would get the appropriate point. We are told that "the actor who portrayed Irving was forced to argue with conviction attitudes he would not normally hold," or words to that effect, the implication being that only a blackguard would question even the most remote details of Holocaust theology.

In concert with this broadcast, Lipstadt's attorneys as well as Canadian "expert" on "moral certainty", Robert Jan Van Pelt, have begun traveling around the country attempting to propagandize at the very locations where the Campus Project has been muzzled. While these tramps abroad may have other reasons for their peregrinations (see related article) it is obvious that they too will provide an outlet for Holocaust propaganda at a time when revisionists will have difficulty mounting a comparable response.

Meanwhile, on the international scene, Lipstadt hit-man, Richard Evans, has been called in to attack a young New Zealand historian whose Master's thesis supported revisionist conclusions. A further dangerous blow was stricken to revisionism in the Southern Hemisphere by the Human Rights Commission in Australia, which demanded that the Adelaide Institute's Website remove all revisionist material from its pages, and that the director, Frederic Toeben, who recently spent six months in a German prison cell on trumped-up charges, is to apologize to the Australian Jewish community.

Is there something coordinated about these events? There may well be. And this apparently coordinated campaign is aimed at revisionists in general and CODOH in particular. The Simon Wiesenthal Center which, by coincidence, is the target of CODOH's current (and so far failed) ad campaign, recently issued a listing of "hate sites" on the Web: CODOH was prominently mentioned.

An Independent Television News, Ltd. article titled "Website confronts the Net Nazis" and published on the Internet tells us that the government of Great Britain is getting into the anti-Holocaust-revisionist business on the World Wide Web. It will begin to celebrate "Holocaust Memorial Day" each year on 27 January, the day the German camp at Auschwitz was liberated by those governed by the Allied tyrant and mass-murderer, Josef Stalin. There is something particularly appropriate about this.

Home Secretary Jack Straw's decision to use the Internet as a platform to promote Britain's first Holocaust

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

Memorial Day has significance far beyond the web's use as a global message board. The site represents a Government effort to reclaim the web from the twilight extremes of the neo-Nazi right who have used it to peddle the myth of holocaust denial.

... the use of the web as an educational tool to underline the reality of the holocaust is critical in the battle to those who use the Internet to deny it ... The web is, however, an equally useful tool for those who want to deny the holocaust or promote virulent anti-Semitism. [One] site regarded as particularly pernicious by the Israeli authorities is the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH). It raises the "allegedly unique monstrosity of the Germans," and while purporting to be an academic exercise, blatantly peddles an anti-holocaust line.

"Israeli authorities?" "... particularly pernicious?" This is getting serious. Which Israeli authorities? The author of this article is not identified. No specific Israeli authority is identified. One thinks immediately of the Mossad. International assassins. Should I leave the light on at night? Would it do me any good? The Mossad record suggests that if they decide they want me, they can have me. I don't think they want me very badly or I would have already been gone. Still, you don't want to get on the wrong side of the Israeli authorities. Unlike myself, Israeli authorities can do two or more things at once. They can move forward with settling Jewish religious fanatics on Palestinian land, shoot those Palestinians who protest, and take care of someone like me all at the same time. They've got a history to prove it.

It's true that revisionism has been shut down in various ways, and is under what appears to be concerted attack in the wake of the huge victory -- because of its publicity -- generated during the Irving-Lipstadt trial. CODOH, including the Campus Project, is under great pressure, but it is also true that CODOH's Internet presence has never been stronger. CODOH's Online E-Zine, *The Revisionist*, alone received 25,000 accesses in October. Each new article or editorial, distributed via the Internet to 1,000+ editors and other media journalists, has caused a continued up-swing in Internet traffic, and favorable comments, via e-mail, have come from many quarters.

Most telling is that in the face of the difficulties of the Campus Project this academic year, the main CODOH Website, the primary portal to Holocaust revisionism the world over, is now receiving some fifty percent more access than this time last year. During the Month of October documents on CODOHWeb, including *The Revisionist*, were accessed 710,218 times!

It isn't going to be easy to maintain a presence this significant, or fund new research, or pay for staff and upgrades, without the continued support of **SR** readers, even in this time of trial. Come what may, we are going to continue to speak truth to power and influence, and we are not gong to allow ourselves to be dispirited or to ever give in. Rather, it's time to make some rather brilliant counter move—and change things around once again.

CONCLUSION: To Put It In A Nutshell

OCTOBER 2000

Every month I write something here about how successful CODOHWeb is.

The most accessed page on CODOHWeb is the "Codoh Discussion Forum" moderated by David Thomas. Following are edited excerpts from a discussion (a "thread") that was started on 24 October. When I decided to run this material in SR there were seventeen messages in the thread. Now there are thirty-six. The Forum receives thousands of accesses daily. While SR readers will be familiar with the ideas discussed here, most students and academics will see it for the first time. On the Internet, the use of pseudonyms is the rule, particularly when the author has a real life while addressing a taboo subject.

Trusty Rusty: Conclusion: To put it in a nutshell: the Holocaust is obviously the greatest taboo of the 20th century. The figures of "6 million" have been grossly exaggerated. The simple fact that no physical evidence of gas chambers exists should cast doubt on the reliability of this tale that goes on forever. Where is the murder weapon we hear so much about? Where are the remains of the "6 million" bodies?

Hub: Gas chambers or no, Holocaust or no, can anyone here seriously doubt that Nazi Germany reigned terror on the Jews of Europe? Can anyone seriously doubt that Jews in Europe were persecuted for centuries for religious and "racial" reasons?

Zionism existed long before the Holocaust. All the Holocaust (however defined) did was give Zionism legitimacy among the majority of Jews who originally were against it. They viewed Israel as a "necessary evil" after the Nazi regime, so they capitulated and accepted it.

But to suggest that Zionism would have existed in the first place

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)
without anti-Semitism is a bit of a stretch. And to that anti-Semitism is the fault of the Jews is what we like to call "blaming the victim."

Cat Scan: Analytically, the Jewish people could still "milk" what happened to them even if there weren't six million victims, gas chambers, or planned genocide. The reason is that at least hundreds of thousands of Jews were slain, men, women, and children, mostly if not entirely on the basis of their ethnicity. Plus millions more were persecuted, plundered, and who may have also died one way or another.

The reasons Jews stick with the traditional story, and refuse to give an inch to revisionists is, I believe, fairly prosaic ones.

#1 EMBARRASSMENT. A lot of prominent Jews, and a few non-Jews -- like Bill Clinton in his famous "Rwandans killed more with machetes in one day than Auschwitz gas chambers" speech, have gone on record crying up these gas chamber stories and they would be embarrassed to admit they screwed up.

#2 FEAR. Jews have been heavily persecuted for the last 120 years or so, and are nervous about admissions of errors in the standard story. They are afraid they will be blamed for these errors, and that "antisemitism" will arise again. It's a legitimate fear, given their recent history; however I don't think it's a legitimate fear given the real conditions. But they need reassurance. Revisionists who question those things in the context of attacking "everything" Jewish, they will perceive you as an enemy and won't give an inch.

#3 LOYALTY. Almost every Jew has an elderly uncle, parent, or grandparent who was in the camps. Some of these old folks admit that they never saw a gas chamber, but others are convinced that they just missed getting gassed, and that all their missing family members were gassed. Jews are sensitive to anything that may upset grandma or grandpa. Including revisionists. There are a lot of inhibitions at work, including distrust.

What's going to happen? Basically what's been happening for the past five years. There will be fewer and fewer references to gassings in the camps by regular historians, who will find locutions to skirt the issue. Fewer and fewer detailed discussions of what happened in the camps. Jews who talk about the Holocaust will operate on greater and greater levels of generality.

After the specifics have not been discussed for some years, someone will finally engage the issue, not only of false gassing claims, but also of the mechanism that led to these false gassing claims. After that, someone will notice that the same mechanism at operation for the false gassing claims created the "true" ones as well. At that point there will be a "surprising" discovery that poison gas was not in fact a medium for killing millions of Jews, and the numbers for the extermination camps will go down.

Prior to that time, the references to a "planned genocide" will recede (this already started in the '80's, that's what the "intentional" vs. "functional" school is about). Finally, it will be recognized that the gassing stories were "mostly" false, but it will probably be another generation before someone has the guts to proclaim the gassing story dead, along with the whole idea of "extermination camps." The last thing to go down will be the "six million", which, for all intents and purposes is already down to about five. All of these people will use revisionist work but revisionists will probably not be credited. The Holocaust story as we know it will be dead in 50 years.

My guess is that the revisionist interpretation will be mainstreamed within the next few years. It will have a minority posture, and will be accepted by people gradually, and they will indicate their acceptance of it by saying less and less about the precepts of the traditional story, but not by actively contradicting it. That's the way these things usually work, historically.

Hannover: While there is some interesting speculation here, there are two points that jump out to me -- and I disagree with them.

1. We do not need Jews to accept the fact that the 'holocaust' as alleged is a myth in order for it to fall. They can cling to their superstition as long as they want, and trust me they will cling to it. The rest of world can merely move past them. Jews are not the final judges as to what the rest of us accepts. Granted, their dominance of the media helps their position, but people can be informed without them. Simply take note of the Internet and CODOH's surging 500,000 hits per month. Jews can change, or risk becoming a laughing stock. It's time to put aside this notion that Jews must sanction something before it becomes 'fact'.

2. I do not accept the vague idea that 'hundreds of thousands' of Jews were deliberately killed by the Germans for their ethnicity (200,000? 900,000?). I stress 'deliberate'. There is no reliable evidence to sustain that assertion. Did Jews die? Of course, there was a helluva war raging and Jews were active in it: guerillas/partisans, Red Army members, and disease in the labor camps, to name some causes. Were there unfair retaliations & war crimes? Sadly yes, but Germany did not lead the pack in this behavior. Think of the German civilians who were butchered for their 'ethnicity' alone.

HUB: Against their rights, Jews were removed from their homes and put into Nazi custody. If they died in that custody, then the blood is on Nazi hands. Period.

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

Hannover: But what was unique about that during WWII? That it happened to Jews? Sadly, it happened to many folks: Germans in Poland, Germans in the USSR, Germans in the Sudetenland, Christians in communist USSR, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, the gulags...etc., etc.

Curious that Ariel Sharon is not considered by the Israeli regime to have blood on his hands, even though he had ultimate responsibility for the mass murders in Lebanon. In general, what I'm talking about is a double standard. The Allies were responsible for far more killings than the Germans, and the Israelis are allowed to get away with mass killings to this day.

Old Sarge: The exact same thing happened to far more Germans at the end of the War, with the added factor that ALL the Allies were trying to starve them to death, even though they were not fighting anymore, or in the case of the women and children, had never been fighting. Curiously, the worst haters were the Americans Morgenthau and General Eisenhower, both of German Ancestry.

DAN: Actually I tend to agree both with Cat Scan and HUB. I lived for 9 years in South Africa with Boers and even though some of the stories about the British concentration camps were as bizarre as the silly belief some Jews have about large-scale gas-chamber murders, the British did, in fact, kill Boers. Maybe it wasn't as intentional as many Boers believe, but they were deprived of the food and medical care they would have received if they hadn't been interned.

David Thomas: The psyche will not open itself to input from hostile/threatening sources. Perhaps a first step toward the dialogue that must occur if this issue is ever to be resolved is to understand that not all Jews believe in or support the confabulations of the holocaust industry. There is no valid reason to expect anyone to do the Ghandi bit in the face of invective and personal attack; it goes too much against human nature. But there are many good reasons to counsel against a hard "us against them" stance when "them" lacks validity.

Jerry: My only other experience of discussing the "Holocaust" issue on the Internet (apart from on this board) was marked by name-calling and extreme nastiness.

To be honest, I find the worst paranoid cases more pitiable than anything else. More irritating are the sophisticated types who write in the media, adopting a supercilious air of superiority as they dismiss the "conspiracy theories" of the "deniers," posing as authorities on the psychological disorders from which "deniers" suffer, and so on. But they too can be deflated, of course. Listen patiently to their theories concerning the alleged psychopathologies of revisionists, and say, "Yes, your theories are extremely interesting, but could you please show us a gas chamber and tell us how it worked?". They have no adequate answer, of course.

All the same, I don't think we should make the mistake of blaming Jews as a whole for any of these things. None of the Jews I have known in real life has appeared to be obsessed with the "Holocaust" and with accusing others over it. A minority of Jews certainly have an extremely intolerant "us and them" outlook, but I think it's better to remain friendly to those who don't. Otherwise the "us and them" problem just gets worse. And after all, the last time the "us and them" mentality got seriously out of hand, it was disastrous both for "us" and for "them". Whoever we think was most to blame, or who suffered the most, World War II was clearly a bad thing all round.

Karl: I have found that the Holocaust is a topic people will mount a vigorous defense of while knowing next to nothing about the details. As you fill them in on the details, they will adjust their defense accordingly. Most people don't like to admit that there is anything they don't know, so when you combine that impulse with the steady deluge of Holocaustomania from the media, this is one belief they have no trouble hanging on to. Since the advent of the Internet, the small percentage of free and open-minded people who are out there – and they are out there -- have a chance to look at rational and reasonable assessments such as the one put up by Cat Scan.

THE LAST WORD

This issue of **SR** is going to the printer eight days earlier than last month. A new catalog is enclosed. We have tweaked the latest mailing of the new campus ad in a very simple way, and it looks like the pot is about to be stirred. And there were more than 700,000 hits on CODOHWeb in October. I'm walking a tightrope with no net, but I'm walking it.

Bradley

Smith's Report

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29 you will receive eleven issues of ***Smith's Report***
[$35 Canada and Mexico
$45 overseas]

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, CA 92143

Voice Mail: 619 687 1950

T & F (Baja): 011-52-661-23986

E-mail: CODOHMail@aol.com

www.codoh.org